HAL VERB
P.O. BOX 42/815
S.F., CA. 94142-1815

AUG-2, 1997

HAROLD WEISBERG
7627 OLD RECEIVER ROAD
FREDERICK, MD. 21702-

Dear Hal:

I received your latest letter & your mention of the "Bogus Revelation" manuscript you've done & I do appreciate your telling Bill to make a copy for me. I've not yet received it but I'm sure he'll get to it.

Bill did send me the manuscript you did on the Newman CIA & Oswald book and I also appreciate receiving that. On both manuscripts I'll not let anyone else handle it nor borrow it as you requested.

I did finish the Newman stuff & I agree wholeheartedly with your observations. Newman was a puzzle to me almost from the start. When I had dinner with him years ago he was insisting to me that Noam Chomsky's writings were ghosted by Alexander Cockburn! I do believe he thought this to be so. It bothered me that he couldn't see that the two writers have totally different styles & their politics although somewhat the same are of different natures.

Another thing about Newman was his failure to reprint the Oswald August 1963 broadcast where Oswald slips & says he was "under the protection of the U.S. government." It was in your book, "Oswald in New Orleans" (1967) but when I asked Newman why he printed the Warren Commission version (in the Volume) he replied that he was unaware of this at the time. I really felt this was extremely disturbing to me as it either showed a lack of interest or scholarship. There was no excuse for it and it placed Oswald in a context the book wanted to prove while avoiding what Oswald was really doing. Finally it became clear to me that ~~Cross~~ Newman had no clear understanding of what the Fair Play for Cuba was all ~~about~~ about. Combine this with his not understanding the picture of the different political movements which Oswald minimally utilized and you have a serious problem of political awareness.

I thought you might be interested that a book dealer I know says Newman's "Oswald & CIA" book is now on the remainder list (I believe it is selling for $5.00).

I'm enclosing several articles with this letter & wanted to call special attention to these -

(1) The S.F. Chronicle editorial on "Why Americans love Conspiracies" (with a reply by a reader). Perhaps you could fit this in with your new "Bogus Revelation" manuscript.

(2) The Tom Lyons article on the Tippit murder and the arrest of Oswald at the Texas Theater
(3) Max Holland's "Nation" review of 2 new books on CUBA & CASTRO.

(4) The "Washington Spectator" referring to Holland's attendance at the recent "COPA" conference in Washington in June, 1997
(5) Dr. Wecht's 8 page article in the "COPA" bulletin (of the June 1997 conference)

(6) Two articles taken from COPA which discuss the first shot timing & placement of the shot both of which I disagree with & I'm sure you will too. If I recall one of them claims a first shot deliberately missed & was a diversion to get the real job done. Of such stuff are sci-fi movies made! With the barest amount of time alloted to them in the firing sequence it is unbelieveable that the assassins would fire a shot deliberately missing. Someone forgot to put on their thinking caps when it came to looking at reality. In any event these are for your records so you can see what is happening out there in "research land".

Nothing else new here except that in September I've been asked to speak on the JFK case & utilize slides I have of the photographs taken. It's been suggested that Aguilar be con-

tacted to see if he'll appear with me. I'll be calling him this week-end. I've not been much in contact with him the last few months & not since he got back from the recent "COPA" event.

I will be going to the Lancer event in Dallas (Nov. 20 to 23, 1991) but haven't decided if I want to speak. A lot of the stuff they put out borders on outright silliness and I do my best to try to put them straight but they do have their own agenda.

By the way if you have the spare time can you send me a zerox copy of the Maryland Law Review article by Kermit Hall. I'd much appreciate it & I can refer to it in my talk on JFK here in S.F. in September.

I will also send you a zerox copy of what Hall wrote about Earl Warren in a book by Hall on the Supreme Court (Oxford edition). Hall said that Warren never should've taken the job as head of the Warren Commission but went no further in explaining Hal's reasoning. If Hall uses the argument that Warren shouldn't have headed the WC because Ruby's case could appear before Warren as Chief Justice this cannot be the answer as to why Warren begged off not wanting to head the Commission. Hall's using that argument just won't wash in case he does use it.

Well, I'll close now. Hope you're doing well.

Best,

Hal Verb